



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2023

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/23/3316565

Kingfishers, Manor Mead, Bickington, Devon TQ12 6JQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Colin Mugford against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01633/HOU, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a garage to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the property known as Kingfishers, accessed off the private road of Manor Mead which serves four other dwellings. The proposed development comprises a garage which would be located at the front of the property, on an area of hardstanding which was used for car parking at the time of my site visit.
4. The front elevation of the proposed garage would be forward of the front building line of the L-shaped property's side gable and would extend behind the rear building line. In addition, given the side elevation of the proposed garage would be sited along the front boundary of the site, alongside the private road, a triangular footprint would be created. Although the design incorporates a dormer window to match those on the existing dwelling, its pitch and fenestration detail would be different. Furthermore, given the depth of the proposed garage, the lower pitch of its roof, in comparison with the property's side gable roof, would be significantly shallower. Therefore, the siting, scale and design of the proposed garage, irrespective of the use of matching materials, would be an incongruous addition to the existing property. Due to the already constrained arrangement of the property, there are limited locations where a garage could be sited. However, this is not a reason to permit unacceptable development.
5. Notwithstanding the differing forms, footprints and frontage boundary treatments associated with the five properties of Manor Mead, all the dwellings are positioned back from their front boundary with the private road, albeit at a

variety of distances and angles. The siting of the proposed garage on the front boundary of the site, irrespective of the absence of a front boundary wall would create an enclosure to the private road, particularly given the substantial evergreen trees on the opposite side. In combination with its incongruous design, the proposed garage would dominate the views along the private road from Riverside Lodge and next to the driveway associated with Peacehaven.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies S1, S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033. These policies seek to ensure new development maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the area, integrates with the surrounding context, designed to be complementary to the existing building and not dominate the street scene. I also find conflict with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to the local area.

Other Matters

7. Although the garage would provide cover from the elements and security for the appellant's cars and motorcycles, this would be a private benefit that would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. Whilst the proposed development would include a dormer to the front elevation and windows to the side, no reference to the use of the proposed garage other than for vehicles, bicycles or other residential storage is indicated on the application plans. I have therefore determined the appeal accordingly.
9. Despite the lack of objections from neighbouring occupiers of the dwellings located off the private road and the supporting comment from the Parish Council, these matters, individually or combined, do not justify allowing the proposed development.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR